UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

On Being an American Citizen - - - - - - - *Haridas T. Muzumdar*

Liberalism Faces a Fear-Ridden World - - - - - - - - *Robert T. Weston*

The Future of the Ethical Movement - - - - - - - - - *A. Eustace Haydon*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXIII NUMBER 4

Chicago, September-October, 1947

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre. 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15. Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Devere Allen: Editor of *Worldover Press.*

Richard F. Behrendt: Professor of International Affairs, Colgate University.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Church in Brooklyn, New York.

A. Eustace Haydon: Leader of the Chicago Ethical Society; formerly head of the Department of Comparative Religions, University of Chicago.

John H. Hershey: Editor of the Quarterly, *Latin American Thought.*

William P. Jenkins: Minister of the First Unitarian Congregation of Toronto.

Alfred McClung Lee: Professor of Sociology, Wayne University, Detroit.

Haridas T. Muzumdar: Professor of Sociology, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas.

Philip Schug: Minister of the Unitarian Church of Urbana, Illinois.

May Stranathan: Reporter and Journalist.

Robert T. Weston: Minister of the First Unitarian Church, Louisville, Kentucky.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 63

ARTICLES—

Liberalism Faces a Fear-Ridden World—ROBERT T. WESTON 64
So You Hate—!—ALFRED MCCLUNG LEE 66
On Being an American Citizen—HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR 67
An Affirmative Faith—WILLIAM P. JENKINS 69
Latin America: Host to Homeless Millions?—RICHARD F. BEHRENDT 70
Protestants in Italy and Spain—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 71
The Division of Europe—DEVERE ALLEN 73
The Future of the Ethical Movement—A. EUSTACE HAYDON 74
The Long Road to Peace—MAY STRANATHAN 75
Voices of Latin America—Alejandro O. Deustua: Peruvian Philosopher—JOHN H. HERSHEY 76
Supernatural Religions Are Similar—PHILIP SCHUG 77

POETRY—

Omnipotence—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 72
The Circle—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 78

THE STUDY TABLE—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 78

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 80

THE FIELD—

News on the Four Winds—*Worldover Press* 62

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

News on the Four Winds

A council of experts, headed by a well-known professor in the Universities of Ghent and Liege, has been set up by the Belgian government, to give advice to the Ministry of Public Health on all sorts of family questions: social, economic, and cultural. Any member of the government, or any legislator, may consult the technicians on the council, which can, however, on its own initiative outline desirable steps to improve the well-being of Belgian family groups.

* * *

Moved by the success of International House on New York's Riverside Drive, and the Paris student center, Cité Universitaire, the British Ministry of Town and Country Planning is studying a special building program for the housing of 3,000 foreign students. The new project is connected with London University, and is expected to be carried out at Croyden, on a site covering nine acres.

* * *

The British Labor Party, beginning with an initial contribution of $2,000, is setting up a trust fund to be used for political education within the labor movement. A sharp differentiation is made between genuine education and partisan propaganda. Courses will be made available for parliamentary candidates, party organizers, study group chairmen, and members of the party's League of Youth. Topics to be covered in the courses include social ethics, history, economics, international affairs, literature, philosophy, art, and science.

* * *

Cologne Cathedral will celebrate its 700th anniversary in August, 1948, though the actual construction does not date back so far. A strenuous effort is being made, despite wartime destruction and post-war difficulties, to replace more than ten thousand square yards of stained glass in time for the commemorative ceremonies.

—*Worldover Press.*

UNITY

Volume CXXXIII SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1947 No. 4

EDITORIAL

What India does with her freedom is important, but the fact that she is free is more important. Now she can make her own mistakes and work toward her own goals. Already grave mistakes are evident and revelations of basic weaknesses are numerous. But they are her own mistakes and her own weaknesses. The division of India along communal lines is a tragic blunder, but it is her own blunder. Riots and murder are pitiful and revolting, but they are engaged in by Indians against Indians and are not the work of an aggressor nation. Rarely has a new nation had more competent leadership than that of Nehru, and if given anything like an even break he will lead India beyond her smoldering ruins and effectively guide her in the building of a great nation. Also a word of commendation should be spoken in behalf of the Labor Government of Great Britain for hastening the day of Indian liberation.

It is obvious that some sort of world organization is the alternative to world chaos. The present United Nations organization, like its predecessor the League of Nations, is not all that it should be. But it is all that we have and every possible effort should be made to make it work. It should not be blamed for things for which it is not responsible and it should not be expected to carry loads beyond its present powers. It should not be a scapegoat for the sins of the great powers, nor should it be merely an instrument of the great powers in foisting their will on the rest of the world. It should be allowed to grow naturally and to assume such responsibilities as experience indicates are possible. The choice is not between a world organization or no world organization. The choice is between a world organization in which all peoples are represented or one that is imposed by a single power or a small combination of powers. Intelligent people should prefer the former and should unite their intelligence in making it certain and secure.

The sense of fairness is deeply imbedded in the spirit of man, and when it is violated there is spontaneous and widespread resentment. A recent opinion poll showed a large majority of the American people opposed to the dismissal of government employes without a hearing. It is obvious that dismissal of employes without a hearing in which charges are made known, with opportunity for reply, is not in accord with the idea of justice. Officials who advocate this practice and legislators who endorse it will have ample reason to regret their violation of the spirit of fair play.

Another area in which the sense of fairness is flagrantly violated is that of the provision in the Taft-Hartley Bill requiring officers of labor organizations to swear that they are not Communists before the members of their organizations can avail themselves of the services of the N.L.R.B. This is not a fair requirement because it applies only to union officers and not to officers of employer organizations, it presumes guilt unless innocence is asserted under oath, and it takes from the members of the unions a right which should be theirs regardless of the accidents of union elections. This should cost Mr. Taft the presidency and condemn Mr. Hartley to political obscurity.

One could readily expand instances of the violation of the sense of fairness. It is not fair for a citizen to be hounded, stoned, and shot at for wanting to live wherever he can secure suitable quarters. And it is not fair for fifteen- and sixteen-year-old boys to be hanged by the neck till they are dead.

On the world scene, it is not fair for babies to die by the millions because statesmen are too dull to organize the production and distribution of the plenty that the earth is able to produce. It is not fair for powerful states to ravage small states. It is not fair for whole groups to be uprooted and transported here and there like cattle. And it is not fair for people to be in terror lest their very thoughts become known to the secret police.

Come to think of it, perhaps the sense of fairness is not as deeply embedded in the spirit of man as I had at first thought. Or perhaps it is so deeply imbedded that it can be blasted into the open only by repeated catastrophic explosions.

Curtis W. Reese.

Liberalism Faces a Fear-Ridden World

ROBERT T. WESTON

During the past year we have become painfully aware of a resurgence of the fear of social change which characterized the years following the first World War. It has not yet reached the heights of that hysteria but it is well on its way. There is, perhaps, a sharper definition of the fear and its objects, and less assurance among liberals of their own objectives and their effectiveness. Following the last war, however, the liberal movement, lacking unity and definiteness of program, wasted most of its energies for at least a decade, while the reactionaries whittled away at basic rights of the people. Duly elected representatives were barred from legislatures, Socialist candidates were barred from ballots in some instances, labor unions were beaten down, and America entered upon a stupid orgy of unsound economic policies at home and abroad that brought disaster upon us, while through most of that period the fear of the Bolshevik regime in Russia, which haunted the reaction, led us to do all possible to deepen and widen the gulf between Russia and the democracies, a gulf of distrust and enmity that did much to bring about the second World War.

The present wave of fear is not greatly different except as conditions favor a more severe development of it. Powerful interests are seeking to bring back the political and economic conditions which led to the depression of the thirties and culminated in the second World War. Anti-democratic forces, chief among which is the powerful Roman Catholic Church, are spearheading the attack on liberal groups and policies, linking them so far as possible with that Russia whom they distrust and fear more than ever and who, they insist, is preparing now a third World War against us. That there may be somewhat more foundation for that fear now than previously does not prevent fear from being the most dangerous way of meeting our problems. Fear is an unreasoning reaction, and those who are possessed by this fear are most suspicious of anyone who proposes that we seek intelligent solutions to our domestic and international problems. Indeed, anyone who criticizes either conservative or reactionary policies, persons or institutions is immediately suspect as Communist.

Much of this fear may be traced to the kind of deliberate smear practices from which no political campaign ever seems to be free, but the originators of smear propaganda usually delude themselves with their fictions. Beginning as traducers of character for political ends, they become convinced that they are crusaders for a holy cause.

For instance, the House Committee on Investigation of Un-American Activities, under the chairmanship of various men, seems to have been as much concerned to discredit liberal programs and persons as to ferret out Communists. It has been totally unwilling to give serious attention to un-American activities which were Fascistic and which during the war gave aid and comfort to the enemy. This in itself is a telling indication of the sympathies and political ideals of its leaders. Yet from preoccupation with besmirchment of liberals the leaders of this committee and similar non-governmental agencies tend to become dupes of their own methods and to believe that when they have pointed suspicion at someone, that is sufficient ground for assuming that he is Communist. With little if any further evidence they demand that governmental employees so besmirched be discharged, and they raise suspicion toward whatever social policies or organizations with which any persons so besmirched may be identified. Private agencies interested in attacking both liberal and Communist or Socialist programs follow similar practices. Paul Mallon in a recent statement, (July 7, 1947, "Behind the News"), quotes several unidentified Senators to the effect that "the really dangerous movement with the unions" is Socialist rather than Communist, and this may indicate that the reactionaries' fear is by no means a fear, as they present it, of men with un-American loyalties.

On the other hand, the Communist is not above making use of this practice of besmirchment, as practiced by reactionaries, as an aid to camouflaging his own identity. (The word "Communist" as used herein, is intended to describe the person who seeks the conversion of American government and our economy to one in harmony with and perhaps under control of that of Russia.) Recognizing the dishonesty and unfairness of his enemies, he welcomes propaganda that identifies liberals as "Communists" since it helps him to disguise himself as a liberal. He feels no obligation to make his enemies' attacks more effective by presenting them an easily recognized target. Driven from the ballot and denied the full normal protection of a citizen under the law, he has developed the technique of "boring from within" both for the concealment it affords him and for the opportunity of achieving control of non-Communist groups which he can use.

This latter effect the liberal is likely to discount. His ultimate objective in world relations is quite commonly that of world government with a democratic basis. His method of working for this is also quite commonly that of insistence on patience, friendliness, and cooperation with all other nations toward this end, and particularly toward Russia since Russian participation is most necessary and Russian opposition most dangerous to this purpose. Therefore he is likely to agree in many respects with the Communist concerning Russia and our whole foreign policy, although he would oppose with all his power any attempt to substitute the Russian system of government and economy for our own. Moreover the liberal is always concerned to correct social and economic evils and to improve the conditions and opportunities of all people, both at home and abroad. This, he knows, is a never-ending task, since change is always occurring and intelligent effort is always necessary to insure that it be wholesome change. The Communist likewise, for his own reasons, is constantly attacking these same problems.

The conservative and the reactionary share fear and suspicion of Russia and tend to insist on counter-action against Russia rather than efforts to explore patiently the possibilities of expanding relations of trust and cooperation with her. Both show a marked disinclination to be bothered about injustices or evils from which they do not suffer and which they do not recognize as menacing them in the future. They are more inclined to suppress disorder with police power than to correct the conditions which produce disorder. Where the liberal believes in the use of intelligence to adapt social and economic systems and forces to human needs, the conservative is inclined to doubt that it is possible, and

the reactionary is against any change which limits his predatory activities or possibilities.

Hence, while the liberal and the conservative may agree in loyalty to a political system which the Communist hopes to destroy and in which the reactionary is interested only for what he can get out of it, the liberal finds that on many lesser issues the conservative and the reactionary are both opposed to him but that the Communist is apparently working with him. This spurious unity confuses him when he is not aware of the political identity of the Communist, and makes him more sympathetic toward the known Communist. It further serves to convince the reactionary that there is no substantial difference between liberal and Communist.

The liberal would be better off if he would recognize that while he has much in common with both conservative and Socialist, he has little in common with either the reactionary or the Communist, both of whom often claim the name "liberal." The reactionary has no interest in democratic process or liberal principles. He is concerned for liberty for himself and his kind only. He distrusts the people, and his interest in his own country as well as in the rest of the world is largely predatory. He is interested in the rest of the world only as a larger field of economic operation or for acquisition of power. World domination interests him, therefore, to the extent that it appears possible, but world government under democratic process would be abhorrent to him unless he were certain that that government would be subverted to his own purposes. His loyalty to his own country is a highly tainted patriotism and is closely akin to Fascism.

Similarly the Communist's interest in world government is very different from that of the liberal. Democratic process is to him only an instrument by which he may work toward power until he is able to seize power, whereupon his openly acknowledged purpose is to destroy that process lest others use it to dislodge him. He may honestly believe that he is working for an ultimate Utopia, but for him the road to it is by violence and by suppression of all opposition. His interest in economic and political injustice is as jaundiced as that of the reactionary. It offers him opportunity, not to correct evils, but to exploit and expand disaffection with the political system in which these things occur. His interest in freedom of speech is largely limited, like that of the Roman Catholic Church, to freedom of speech for himself and those who work with or for him. He tends to regard the liberal as a weakling or sentimentalist whose sympathies may be exploited, or as a possible convert, or as a confused reactionary.

The liberal believes in liberty, not for himself alone, but for everyone. He believes that the best way to defeat error is not to suppress it but to let it be out in the open and then deal with it by reason and not violence. He remembers that both reactionary and Communist are human, and he would protect their rights as human beings while seeking through the use of reason to lead them to respect the rights of others. He would resort to violence only when it must be used to stop violence. He is opposed to the use of untruth, whether by implication or by direct statement, as a means of combatting or converting his opponents. But since the truth is not always clear or easily distinguished from error, he is definitely handicapped in his struggle with those who do not hesitate to embroider facts or to use misrepresentation in support of their positions.

The liberal is too inclined to hope that truth will assert itself and become self-evident, that falsehood will be obvious enough to serve as its own repudiation. This is a dangerous assumption, unwarranted by the evidence. Many a good man's usefulness has been ruined by malicious slander, and many a good organization has lost its value as a result of besmirchment. One of the oldest techniques in politics is that of defeating a candidate by discrediting him with unfounded allegations spread sometimes by whispering campaigns, and often enough by mere vigorous repetition. The Nazis were successful with a propaganda system which Hitler did not hesitate to state boldly: that a big lie repeated with vehemence will be believed more readily than a little one. It will be supposed that no one would dare say such things if they were not true.

The Communist does not hesitate to lump the liberal, the conservative, and the reactionary—and the Socialist also—in one group as "Fascist." But Communist propaganda has very little influence in our country, and it does little damage by its violent language. On the other hand, the reactionary, who likewise does not hesitate to accuse the liberal of being a Communist, has tremendous power and influence. He is entrenched in the press and in high places in both business and government. He can obtain wide circulation for his statements, and he can bring heavy economic pressure to bear in support of his opinions. It is not safe, therefore, to assume that his groundless accusations can be disregarded.

Caught between the extreme right and the extreme left, the liberal's only defense is his regard for the truth and his vigor and effectivenes in clarifying and presenting a liberal program. He cannot afford not to assert them. He must not suppose that he can appease the reactionary by moderation of his policies or through the exercise of caution avoid besmirchment by the poison tongue and the poison pen. The only result of such caution must be the abandonment of his principles and programs, for as fast as a liberal program or organization appears it is tarred with the charge of "Communist." Chairman Thomas of the Un-American Activities Committee has recently stated that the Committee has seven rooms filled with indexed files containing what he hoped was one million names of suspected members of "un-American" organizations or their fronts, and that one hundred thousand of these people are Communists. The implication concerning the nine hundred thousand seems clear—nine hundred thousand names to be smeared. This is ammunition, not for Americanism, but for reactionary purposes, for the discrediting of liberals.

For let us consider the methods common to most reactionary propagandists. If a man accused of being a Communist serves, or has served, on the board or as a sponsor of some organization, that is sufficient to smear the organization as "Communistic," or as "Communist front," and certainly if several persons who have been so accused have been identified with the organization. None of the people who serve as the excuse for smearing the organization need be Communist at all; it is only necessary that their names have been or can be linked with some activity in which so-called Communists have been active. Thus we arrive at a circular situation in which a man can be considered a Communist if he has participated in activities which have been labelled as "Communistic" and in which the label

"Communistic" was derived from the fact that men like himself have participated in it. The possibilities thus opened up and which may be used to elaborate on this process are very wide indeed. The fact that some fine-sounding organizations actually are Communistic or Communist front organizations simply helps to cast suspicion on all organizations which in dealing with like problems are not reactionary.

No liberal is immune from such treatment, and, indeed, if one reference to a liberal is made anywhere listing him as a Communist or Communist sympathizer, that one reference may be mushroomed into a number of references by different agencies which then serve to confirm each other, even though all of them rest on a single original reference which may have been without foundation. Probably most of such original references go unused until the man they slander does something outstanding that displeases the reactionaries; then it is dug up and multiplied.

Thus a recent pamphlet charging the editor of the *Christian Register* with being a Communist offered in support of its charges many quotations from the pages of that magazine as being samples of Communist expression. Among them were quotations from several Unitarian ministers whose integrity as liberals no honest liberal would question. Now, however, their words having been cited as samples of Communist utterance, the clear implication is that they are Communists. It remains only for other reactionaries to pick up these references and spread them to bring serious discredit upon these ministers. To ignore such looseness with truth is to invite trouble. It is to encourage the smear artists to carry on. It is to allow the reactionary to whittle away at liberalism until the liberal way of life is discredited because people have lost faith in liberal leadership.

The answer is not easy to make, for the liberal is inclusive in his sympathies and likely to be generous even toward his calumniators. Nevertheless, liberalism will hardly be effective if it does not make the answer, which is twofold. First the liberal must develop and maintain an aggressive and distinctive policy and program, and must not allow himself to be deterred by name-calling and other means of smearing his activities. By defining and defending his policies against both reactionary and Communist distortion of them, he will both strengthen his cause and make more difficult the claims of both these groups to the name "liberal." He will attract far greater support than now, for it is very difficult for anyone to feel strongly drawn to, or be willing to work for, abstract principles whose practical application is only vaguely suggested and cannot be definitely identified. Second, it is becoming necessary for the liberal to challenge those who seek to discredit liberals as "Communist," and to compel them to support their charges with evidence which is reliable or else make public retraction of their charges. If they will not answer or defend their charges, their refusal to do so may be cited as evidence of their dishonesty. It is not enough to rebuke those who employ smear practices, nor is rebuke likely to be effective. Item by item, the misrepresentation of facts and attacks upon character should be presented to them for verification or retraction. Otherwise the charges once made remain unchallenged, and others may use and enlarge upon that fact. An aggressive liberalism will put its traducers on the defensive and will impress the uncertain multitudes with its vigor and soundness. A liberalism which retreats from causes that have been slandered and which looks askance at its own people will be weak and ineffective. It is possible, perhaps, for reactionaries to confuse liberals with Communists simply because liberals have been fearful of battle and unwilling to clarify their own positions. But if the liberals adopt and maintain an aggressive policy, they will in so doing clarify their positions with reference to both Communists and reactionaries. There is no need for confusion as to their relation with either group. Failure to clarify it and to challenge the confusion which the opponents of liberalism seek to create leads only to futility. It plays into the hands of these enemies, who are to be recognized as being the extremists of both the right and the left.

We may yield to the fear hysteria, and end by suspecting each other so completely that we cannot work together at all, and so allow our country to become the victim of a Fascist trend or, ultimately, a Communist putsch. Or we may go on sacrificing man after man to those who attempt to destroy liberalism by discrediting its leaders and its program. This amounts to the same thing. Far better, it seems to me, is a courageous, aggressive liberalism which backs its traducers into a corner and exposes them for what they are, which develops a clearly defined program which the people can understand and recognize as in their own interest, and which therefore enables the people to distinguish between their enemies and their friends. We know where the policies dictated by fear and smear lead: depression and war. We took that road last time; we cannot afford to follow it again.

So You Hate—!

ALFRED McCLUNG LEE

So you hate the Communists or the Ku Kluxers? So you hate the Negroes, Jews, Roman Catholics, Protestants, unionists, or capitalists! So you hate alcoholics or prohibitionists, Republicans or Democrats, the brilliant or the stupid! So you hate—!

You hate some group of men and women. This hate, you think, is not a temperamental or a sadistic matter. You hate because—and you can present long series of reasons why you hate. The Communists threaten to overthrow American society. The Ku Kluxers threaten to establish a dictatorship of the vicious and venal. The Negroes, Jews, Roman Catholics, Protestants, unionists, or capitalists are getting too much power. The alcoholics are created by and maintain the Booze System, and the prohibitionists would again put society into a puritanical straightjacket beneficial chiefly to bootleggers. The Republicans or Democrats are similarly at the "root of it all." The brilliant outsmart us, and the stupid enter into compacts of incompetents to exploit the rest of us.

But what do we accomplish by hating? No Communist or Ku Klux movement, to take but two of our illustrations, has ever been exterminated by hate or even bloodshed. World War II certainly did not eliminate Nazism, Fascism, or authoritarianism. Hatred warps the judgment and obscures the vision of those who hate. To state the matter briefly, either the haters of groups or the groups hated, or both, are frequently suffering from a kind of illness. They are socially maladjusted. They have characteristics of the psychoneurotic or mentally sick.

And this is not to be wondered at. As Thoreau said, in his *Walden,* "The mass of men lead lives of quiet desperation." The people who are called "normal" have adjusted to the "quiet desperation" of life problems through social experiences, through the solace of meditation, and through the ministrations of the beautiful. Those who feel frustration welling up within them find some socially-permissible scapegoat toward which they can direct that deep-seated emotional bitterness. The most respectable scapegoat available today is the Communist Party, a loose term for a wide range of left-wing political and economic extremists. Upon it desperate and insecure men and women shower tremendous hatred.

If one wished to do something to minimize the number and influence of Communists or Fascists, the last thing to do would be to become emotionally involved in hating them. A sane approach would be to regard them much as psychiatrists regard alcoholics, firebugs, or sex offenders—as patients who are ill. When any kind of an unhappy or maladjusted person is viewed as a patient, he begins to look less like an object of fear or hatred and more like an unfortunate whose life has been twisted by circumstances and events. It is then apparent that such a one might speak of himself as Shakespeare put it in *Macbeth*: Here is one "whom the vile blows and buffets of the world have so incensed that I am reckless what I do to spite the world." Psychiatrists can help such people, but hatred and repressive measures merely exaggerate the illness, drive their groups "underground," and help them attract converts.

Every healthy society contains groups of extremists of all types, just as every healthy human being contains germs of a vast number of disorders. Neither the extremist groups nor the germs are dangerous so long as the society or body remains reasonably healthy. They spread rapidly when they are encouraged by problems of nourishment, tension, or strain.

The noisy and bothersome groups are symptoms of social disorders. When they are not extensive, they are useful means for permitting maladjusted people to work themselves out of their maladjustments. Far more serious are the hatreds of greater numbers, especially when those hatreds are expressed against acceptable groups in our society—the Jews, Roman Catholics, Protestants, trade unionists, and capitalists.

When a clubwoman can speak in her club of the Negroes or Jews with hatred and not be challenged, a dangerous virus has spread beyond manageable limits. When a trade unionist can gain office in his union on an anti-Catholic or anti-Protestant platform, the most dread social disease in modern society is spreading and strengthening its grasp. When a businessman emotionally orates that he has "no choice but to fight it out to the last ditch" against a union, he is exhibiting a lack of sensibility that can only be described as neurotic—if he really means it.

Fear and hatred stalk modern man. More than at any previous time in human history, mankind has the physical assets available for abundant living, and yet mankind lives in "quiet desperation."

Nothing can be gained by fear and hatred, and they are not lost in the stupor following "shots in the arm" of authoritarian social and religious theories. Authoritarian theories direct and exploit the discontented.

Only a return to a sane belief in the values of man as man and of democracy and the other ideals of the Judeo-Christian tradition, together with the development of a sound and informed regard for the teachings of psychiatry and of social science, can help to deliver man from his present world-wide dilemma.

On Being an American Citizen

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR

On July 7, 1947, in the District Court of San Miguel County, Las Vegas, New Mexico, Honorable Judge Luis Armijo conferred upon me one of my most precious possessions, American citizenship.

Now I am trying to ask myself what this thing, called becoming an American citizen, means.

First, it means to me a new birth. The pledge of allegiance to the United States of America means that some of my old loyalties must be given up, some rearranged, and some new loyalties assumed. I cannot and will not deny the land of my birth, Mother India. My spiritual values and inspirations have been, in the first instance, derived from the rich and noble legacy of my forbears who went to India some 6,000 years ago, while their cousins went to Europe. I still consider myself heir to the noble Sanskrit language, eldest sister of all European languages, and to the Hindu system of numerals miscalled Arabic. I still look upon Mahatma Gandhi as one of the prophets of our age, and I cherish my past associations with him.

My new birth means that whereas in the past I used to think of serving India, America, and the world, henceforth my humble effort shall be to serve America, India, and the world. Being a product of two cultures, Hindu and American, I shall strive to import into the American scene some of the positive values of Hindese culture. The exalted philosophy of India and the dynamic democracy of America can be wedded together, and it shall be my humble effort to promote such a consummation.

Second, my new birth as an American citizen enables me to graft onto the youthful virility of this nation the mellow philosophy and outlook of ancient India.

Third, while the American-born citizen takes his citizenship for granted, I cherish the privilege of American citizenship. I have now become a coworker

with 140,000,000 of my fellow American citizens in the task of demonstrating and living the values of democracy. Citizenship confers obligations as well as privileges. The most cherished privilege of American citizenship is that one may look the world in the eye confidently, with self-respect, viewing others as equals. The most significant obligations of American citizenship are: teamwork, reconciliation of conflicting interests by good will and by due process of law, performance of tasks at hand directed toward the improvement of our local community, state and nation, and, we hope, the world.

Fourth, being an American citizen means not only taking part in the civic affairs of one's community, but also active participation in the making of policy for one's community, state, and nation—and the world. I am looking forward with great eagerness to the day when I shall cast my first ballot in an election. America is called upon to demonstrate to the sick world that the way of ballots is far superior to the way of bullets—and much more enduring.

Fifth, democracy rests upon the assumption that the voice of the people is the voice of God. But the judgment or action of a people operating as a crowd or a mass is anything but divine. Hence the wise Thomas Jefferson taught that an enlightened citizenry is essential to a healthy democracy. I do not foresee this nation of ours doing anything seriously wrong; but if ever, unfortunately, my America should tread the path of wrongdoing and unrighteousness, I would discharge my obligation as a citizen by working with might and main for righteousness and justice and good will.

Sixth, my acquisition of American citizenship reminds me of my childhood experiences. In a literal sense, George Washington beckoned to me to come to this country. In the *Second Gujarati Reader* of my grade school, there was a lesson about a boy named George Washington and about his experiences with the cherry tree and his Dad. The lesson ended by saying, "And the truth-telling George Washington became the Father of his country." In my childish way of thinking, I mused to myself that if George Washington was so good and if he became the Father of his country, his children, too, must be good and truth-telling; some day I ought to visit George Washington's children. Well, I have been here for a quarter of a century and I can truthfully say that my childish picture of George Washington's children has been found to be true—true, that is, in every respect except when the American people are engaged in a political election campaign. I cannot vouch for the truthfulness of Washington's children when they are engaged in the national pastime of election campaigns! That reminds me that as a citizen I am assuming a special responsibility to try out whether an election campaign cannot be carried on without mud-slinging.

Seventh, to the saints and heroes of India I have now added the heroes and saints and statesmen of the New World. I can visualize Emperor Asoka (third century B. C.) and William Penn walking hand in hand, striving to bring about a warless world. The wise and heroic Washington, the statesmanlike Thomas Jefferson, the philosophic Benjamin Franklin, the saintly Lincoln, the soldierly Grant and Lee—these makers of America are now part of my forbears. Emerson and Thoreau and Walt Whitman reinforce the outlook of universalism I had inherited from the culture of India.

Eighth, as a humble soldier in the non-violent army of Mahatma Gandhi, I contributed my share toward the breakup of the British Empire in India. The result, however, is less pleasing than anticipated. India is distraught and divided. I hope she may learn from the federal union idea of America. However, it is not for me now to urge upon India any specific plan of action; I can but offer a bit of advice as an American citizen interested in the well-being of India's four hundred million people.

Ninth, as an American citizen I cannot be blind to the gigantic tasks confronting us of the present generation both at home and abroad. Here at home the relations between capital and labor must be adjusted on the basis of mutual accommodation and reciprocal responsibility. Political liberty must be implemented with economic security within the framework of our democratic society. Abroad, even before the last shot of the military campaigns was heard, a new threat to peace and orderly procedure was posed by our Ally, the Soviet Union. The iron curtain must be lifted if the world in our generation is to experience a new birth of freedom. As an American citizen, I am proud of the statesmanlike behavior and accomplishments of General MacArthur in Japan. But our handling of the China situation is less satisfactory. I believe Yalta was an act of appeasement and must be undone. The Truman-Marshall doctrine is worthy of the noble traditions of America. One must say, however, that there is a certain amount of timidity in our State Department. The descendants of pioneers must cast off timidity. Cooperation, secured at the expense of compromise and appeasement, is not worth having. Non-cooperation resting on principle is preferable to co-operation based on appeasement. The solid body of American principles of democracy is more than a match for the most rampant totalitarianism in the world.

Tenth, as an American citizen, I realize the urgent need today for us to live in the spirit of Mahatma Gandhi and the Great Emancipator. With malice toward none, with charity for all, with chivalry toward the vanquished; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to bind up humanity's wounds, to care for him, friend or foe, who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all, which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations. Such is the spirit of Lincoln, of America, within the context of our times.

For generations America has stood as a beacon-light to the world hungering for freedom. The American Declaration of Independence has given inspiration to the oppressed of the world. The American Constitution holds forth the promise of American life to all who care to accept it. American federalism may bring hope and life to a dying Europe and to strife-torn India and China. The American insistence on the dignity of man is the one bright spot in our darkened world. The Founding Fathers are watching us; we cannot fail them.

As an American citizen, I hope to do my humble share in maintaining intact the noble heritage of this great land, in enriching that heritage, and in bringing within the reach of all mankind the promise of American life.

An Affirmative Faith

WILLIAM P. JENKINS

When asked about our beliefs, we Unitarians are first prompted to make a negative reply. We are quick to say what we do not believe in order to explain our divergence from orthodoxy. This is a bad habit which historic debate and defensive position have forced upon us. Unfortunately we leave the impression that Unitarians are unbelievers. No wonder, then, that the "outsider" cannot understand how we hold together!

We must break this habit of the past if we would give our friends a true picture of Unitarianism. Ours is a positive faith with rich content. We are not unbelievers, but people who believe differently. It is the things we do believe that unite us and direct us into our pattern of activities. We have a faith that affirms, and we need to be so clear about that faith that we can state it readily when questioned.

It is fitting that we should consider the salient points of this positive faith that is shared by all of us. Then we can go forth to life better able to express and to activate our faith. Here, then, is the pattern of our religious beliefs stated in the affirmative.

Ours is a faith that asserts the goodness of man. We see man as a child of the universe, a product of nature. He is one with the energies, the materials, the forces that shape and direct the universe. More than that, man stands at the apex of the evolutionary thrust. He alone has consciousness, reasoning power, understanding. He is the fruit of ages past, and bound up within him is the still greater evolutionary advance to come.

Man is a creature subject to many limitations. His understanding is not perfect, his comprehension is not infinite. Therefore he makes mistakes and he commits evil acts. But in spite of this, man works to correct his mistakes; he fights his evils; he struggles to solve his problems and "advance on chaos and the dark." Where other religions denounce and belittle man, we have faith in him. Man is capable of overcoming evil, of solving his problems, and of making real progress.

We Unitarians have learned, however, that, in order to advance, man must be free. We believe, therefore, in the freedom of man. Truth, beauty, goodness are most quickly discovered by men whose bodies and minds are free—free to seek, to experiment, to make mistakes; but also free to discover new truths, better ways of living. Only in an atmosphere of freedom can man improve and solve his problems. And we insist on extending this freedom to the field of religion, for man must be completely free or he is not free at all.

Freedom, to be useful, demands responsibility. Freedom without an accompanying sense of responsibility is license. So we believe in the responsibility of man. Man must accept responsibility for all his acts. Traditional Christianity insists on man's responsibility for his sins but does not give him credit for his achievements. Man must also be given credit for his advances. He is responsible for war; but he is also responsible for the inventions of peace and for the peaceful organization of large communities.

We believe in the goodness of man, the freedom of man, and the responsibility of man.

Another principle long held by Unitarians is belief in the organic wholeness of the universe. This was originally expressed as the "Unity of God." Hence, the name "Unitarian." This name is still significant because we believe in the unity of nature and the unity of humanity.

We believe in one world. We believe in a true universe. We reject the dualisms of heaven and earth, spirit and matter, natural and supernatural. Whatever we believe about God, it is never a God apart from and opposed to our world. God is within the universe, within nature, within man. This universe moves according to principles discoverable by science. We reject miracles and the arbitrary concept of God as unworthy of the grandeur and order of the universe.

We believe in the unity of nature. The world of nature as we know it is the product of an age-long development. It presents a complex structure of successively more intricate patterns of organization, all interrelated and all composed of the same "world-stuff." From the simple structure of the atom, nature developed the molecule, the life-cell, plants, animals, man. Each of these structures is more complex and each manifests new qualities. But each is dependent on the others and all are built of the same basic stuff.

Man is part of the unity of nature. He stands at the peak of the emergent process, dependent upon nature and nature in turn dependent upon him.

We believe therefore in the unity of mankind. All men are part of growing, emergent nature. All are of the same species. All are interdependent. Unless men cooperate for the control of nature and for their own advancement they will cut off their future. Thus we believe in human brotherhood. This means in practice the development of good race relations. It means the feeding of the world's starving millions. It means the emancipation of millions from the bondage of ignorance, poverty, and disease. This faith recognizes the necessity for world culture and world government.

Understanding the basic unity of nature and of mankind we realize that only by emancipation, tolerance, cooperation can men develop the world culture needed to insure the continued growth of the human spirit.

We believe in the principle of growth. We see life as a process of growth—in nature, in our bodies and in our minds. Civilizations and social institutions are also subject to this principle of growth. When growth stops in a plant or a mind or a civilization the results are the same: decay and death. Growth demands change; growth demands experimentation and new discovery. The whole forward thrust of evolution is brought about through experimentation and change. The growth of human society reveals an even greater dependence on experimentation and adaptation of new ideas.

Unitarians are often criticized as unbelievers, but it is not lack of faith that forces us to reject the creeds. Our deep faith in the principle of growth does not permit us to crystalize old truths into a body of sacred dogmas. A dogma is a dead truth embalmed for posterity. Its place is in the museum, not in the mind of living man.

Thus we believe in the method of science as a tool of discovery and growth. It may not be a perfect tool, but it is the best we have yet found which can guide us to new discovery and more rapid growth, physically, socially, psychologically.

Thus we think of religion as a movement, not as an institution; a congregation, not a church. One is a living movement, the other a formalized institution. We think

of religion as a set of guiding principles based upon disciplined experience and always open to change. We reject dogma as stultifying.

Because man is part of the whole life-process we believe we can aid the process of growth. That is why we place such great emphasis on education. That is why we have a Unitarian Service Committee. That is why Unitarians are active in all movements for social improvement. That is why we work for a better world—because we believe that we can do something to achieve it.

And so we have a faith that affirms life. We do not withdraw from society as the monks did. We do not deny life as the Puritans did. We do not seek escape from this life as the mystics and millenarians do. We believe that the world and life and man are good, and so we live to the full.

I hope that these thoughts bring to all of us a fuller realization that we have an affirmative faith. While we differ on many questions, we yet move round a core of agreement. While we deny many beliefs, that very denial grows out of our positive faith.

To sum it up then:

We believe in the goodness, the freedom, and the responsibility of man.

We believe in the unity of the universe, of nature, and of mankind.

We believe in the principle of growth; growth through free inquiry, scientific experiment, and broad education.

We believe in the goodness of life and the possibility of making life better.

We have a faith that affirms. Let us clarify it, assert it, and live it!

Latin America: Host to Homeless Millions?

RICHARD F. BEHRENDT

Most promising of all large-scale areas for settlement projects in our time is undoubtedly Latin America. What hope this can mean for the 1,000,000 permanently displaced persons who still vegetate in European detention camps and makeshift dwellings, without homes, normal family life, or work! They, and millions more, long with feverish intensity to escape from Europe, the grave of so many hopes and lives, and build anew.

In Latin-American countries no prejudices of a self-appointed master race poison the air for a newcomer. Besides, these lands need immigrants from Europe, and have proclaimed as much ever since Juan Bautista Alberdi, distinguished Argentine thinker, long ago made the classic pronouncement that "to govern is to populate."

The so-called social and economic backwardness of many countries to the south is partly due to the fact that, unlike Anglo-America, they never received a sizable number of European settlers with superior technical training, economic initiative and, in some cases, experience in self-government. Despite almost constant professions of eagerness for immigration, only a few Latin-American countries—Argentina, Uruguay, southern Brazil and south-central Chile—received large numbers of settlers. During and after the world depression of the 1930s, most of the nations adopted restrictive measures, sometimes modeled on the national quota system of the United States.

This restrictive policy is now in some degree being officially changed. Brazil, with a new immigration law, has made plans to let in 100,000 newcomers a year, though the scheme has been watered down of late. However, Brazil, Argentina, and Peru have had commissioners in Europe making preparatory studies for the selection of suitable immigrants.

For a number of years, the Dominican Republic has offered settlement to refugees from Europe. At the ill-fated Refugee Conference of 1938 in Evian, that country was practically the only one to make a concrete proposal. A few hundred refugees responded, but the experiment was hampered by transport difficulties caused by the war. Yet the country has repeated its willingness to receive up to 100,000—and its geographical area is only half the size of Virginia.

Rural folk in Latin America urgently need doctors, dentists and pharmacists. Among the displaced persons in the American zone of Germany alone, reported Mr. La Guardia in November, 1946, there were 1,026 physicians and surgeons, 677 dentists and 579 pharmacists. Latin America, anxious to develop public utilities and industries, needs technicians and administrators. In the detention camps of the American zone it could find 692 civil engineers, 371 architects, 2,539 business executives, and 3,985 auditors and bookkeepers.

Vast areas in South and Central America are underpopulated or virtually empty. The population density of Latin America is 17 per square mile, as against 45 in the United States. All the 20 republics of this region, two and a half times as large as the continental United States, have, as a whole, a smaller population. A relatively high percentage of the people are concentrated in urban regions.

The "Oriente" of Colombia, more than half the entire country, with an area equal to that of prewar Germany, Austria, and Belgium combined, or twice that of Japan, has about 125,000 inhabitants. Great areas in central Brazil, southern Argentina, northern and eastern Bolivia, central and southern Venezuela, the eastern territories of the West Coast republics of South America, and the highlands of Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Panama, can in theory support many millions of people. Yet they are among the least populated parts of the globe.

Equally obvious, however, are the obstacles to rural settlement by natives of the temperate zone and of more or less industrialized countries: the torrid and wet climate; tropical diseases; long distances to markets and sources of supply, with poor communications. Large groups of the native population would in some cases be indifferent or even hostile, looking askance at efforts to give aliens land and a comparatively comfortable livelihood, in countries where most of the native-born lack both. The greed of influential land speculators will be met with, too, along with land monopolists—and, above all, unstable political and economic conditions.

The real opportunities lie somewhere between the bright theoretical prospects and the dark picture often painted by skeptics. The climate is not uniformly unhealthful; high areas escape excessive heat; temperate regions are available; sanitation has advanced; contrary to the myth fostered by white colonists living among colored peoples, no evidence exists that manual

work in the tropics, where sanitation has been introduced, is harmful to whites.

Modern air transport and roads are opening up vast areas until now remote and sometimes unexplored. Advances in agriculture and the use of tropical and subtropical products made during the war point to new and promising lines of endeavor.

Much will depend on the attitude of European immigrants. They will have to show genuine willingness to adapt themselves to the new environment, with its strange and at first difficult conditions. They must determine to make a go of it and stick it out, without the seeming easy refuge of city life and its business ventures. Claims to remain a separate minority group within the host country will have to be abandoned. The languages, traditions, and problems of the new country should be studied, positive relations with the native people cultivated, and joint enterprises and intermarriage encouraged. Immigrants must consider themselves at once partners and fellow citizens of the people among whom they make their new homes. This need not mean the dropping of separate religious ties.

On the other hand, Latin-American governments and people can do much to help sound resettlement by their own attitudes. They need to set up careful, long-range plans for settlement, not subject to the frequent changes and hazards of political fortune. All agencies will need to assume grave responsibilities toward the newcomers as well as their own people. Settlers must be protected against exploitation by officeholders.

A fair chance must be given for newcomers to become permanent citizens and to develop the loyalty and emotional attachment which can thrive only on mutual helpfulness, and on equal rights and opportunities. Good land will need to be provided, in accessible places, with adequate credit facilities, public health, education, cooperatives, and local community life.

But international agencies and nations not directly affected have responsibilities also. They will have to aid the Latin-American nations in selecting the most desirable types of immigrants, and arranging transportation to the New World. They will need to carry some of the financial burden of resettlement. Especially will they need to share in a permanent international organization devoted to problems of migration.

This world agency, which should have broader responsibilities than the International Refugee Organization, should make continuous studies of population changes and migration movements, national and international, and it should cooperate with governments, semi-official and private agencies in carrying forward resettlement projects.

Tremendous as the "displaced persons" problem is in terms of human suffering and in the responsibility of those who can help to solve it, the task is ridiculously small in comparison to the problems of war—such as training and equipping military forces, making huge production adjustments, and finding means of long-distance transport. Constructive resettlement policies are important tests of our time in international cooperation. Such policies are demanded not only in the interest of those millions of our contemporaries who must rebuild their lives, but for the sake of young countries in need of new productive citizens. They are demanded most of all, perhaps, in the interest of world order—the most vital concern of us all.

Protestants in Italy and Spain

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

Of the famous Four Freedoms enunciated by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in his message to the United States Congress on January 6, 1941, none is more sacred or more precious to our hearts than the second one which speaks of the "freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—*everywhere in the world.*" This fundamental freedom of our American way of life we fought to preserve as we took up arms to oppose those tyrannical forces in the world that sought to destroy not only this but every other freedom as well. Today, we wonder whether our terrible sacrifices of blood, sweat and tears have helped much to advance and establish the reign of the Four Freedoms; and surely we must be aware of the fact that Freedom of Religion is today in many sections of the world as much in jeopardy as are the other three freedoms.

It is both interesting and comforting to observe in this respect that in those countries where "democratic governments" are in power and where Protestants are the religious majority the freedom so essential to every other human liberty, viz., religious freedom, is more firmly established and more effectively secured and protected than anywhere else. Take, for example, such predominantly Protestant countries as the United States, Great Britain, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, Finland, etc. In every one of these lands the liberty of religious and dissenting minorities to worship and propagandize their faith is scrupulously defended even where the established faith is one that for centuries has been identified as a "State Church." This was also true of prewar Germany. This is not to say that in Protestant countries there are not attempts at stifling and hampering religious minorities. Germany, in the days of Bismarck, had her *Kulturkampf,* and America still has her K.K.K. and other lunatic-fringe organizations that seek to arouse prejudice and hatred against other faiths, such as Catholics and Jews. But by and large it is true that in democratic lands with Protestant traditions, religious freedom has had a much better chance for survival and growth than elsewhere. It is, for instance, true beyond the shadow of a doubt that in the United States it is such dissenting and "heretical" churches as the Unitarian and Universalist that are the first to protest any discrimination or curtailment of rights involving other religious groups.

Today, religious freedom is being most seriously threatened from two quarters, that of Communist Totalitarianism and that of Clerical Fascism. In the case of Communist Russia, e.g., it is really quite silly to speak of religious liberty, when the right to worship, educate in and propagandize any given faith is hedged about by legal restrictions and provisions that in the final analysis make the State the arbiter over the mind and conscience of the people. There is no such thing

as freedom to worship, so long as this freedom does not include every other freedom associated with the traditional practice of churches and religious societies. On the other hand, the term "religious freedom" becomes a mockery and a delusion when it is employed by governments that can and are used by State Churches to limit and curtail the rights of those who profess and practice a faith dissenting from that of the State and the prevailing religious majority; and the question seems in order: Which is worse, to have an allegedly "atheistic" government restrict the religious liberties of its citizens, or to have a so-called "Christian" government lend its legislative, judicial, and police powers to the limitation of the rights of religious dissenters and minorities? The answer is, of course: They are both violations of the sacred principle of religious freedom, and the latter must be judged worse because it involves not only political tyranny but hypocrisy as well.

We have recently had disturbing evidence of the usurpation of political power by State Churches from both Italy and Spain, where the established religion has for centuries been that of Roman Catholicism. In the New Italy which, so we hope, will emerge from the tragedy of the last war as a real Republic, the Protestant minority has voiced its grave concern over legislation that is designed to maintain the favored position that Roman Catholics have always enjoyed in Italy, as well as to encroach upon the religious and civil liberties of the Protestant minority. For instance, Roman Catholic religious teaching is to be enforced in all Italian schools under the protection of the State, and the laws governing marriage and divorce are to maintain the rigidity that they have always had under the guidance of Catholic moral teaching. Not only have Protestants in Italy expressed a growing concern for their privileges, but a recent cable to America states that "Italian Jewry asks the Italian constituent Assembly to guarantee equal rights for all religions and assails the favoritism being shown to Roman Catholics."

Even more disquieting news comes from Franco's Spain. According to a well-authenticated editorial in the well-known "undenominational" Protestant weekly, *The Christian Century,* published in Chicago, Illinois, an appeal was sent by Protestant ministers in Spain to their Protestant colleagues in America last fall, requesting that some sort of aid be given to the small Protestant minority in Spain, numbering only about 30,000, in preserving their rights as religious communities to worship, to print literature, to practice religious education, and to propagandize their faith. To the shame of the American news agencies and newspapers be it said that, although this appeal was sent to this country via the Associated Press and by a responsible correspondent of a well-reputed Midwestern daily, it received practically no mention at all in the newspapers of America. The same is true of another report by another correspondent of the same paper, reporting the reaction of an important but anonymous Vatican spokesman to this news from Spain. In both instances, the press of the land, with the exception of the *Detroit News,* hushed up the entire affair, and it was only through the courage and candor of *The Christian Century* that this sorry state of affairs in Spain received any publicity at all.

Here are five points made by the complaint of the Protestant ministers, who for obvious reasons have asked that they remain unnamed, in their bill of indictment against the State Church of Spain which evidently seeks to throttle any dissident and "heretical" religious movement there: (1) Protestants do not have the right to withdraw their children from Catholic teaching in the public schools, nor can they establish Protestant schools. (2) They may not print Protestant literature, not even hymnbooks. (3) Protestants who have been baptized as infants in the Catholic Church can be legally married only by a priest. (4) Protestants do not have equal rights to government jobs. (5) Protestants may not carry on missionary work.

Equally interesting was the reaction of a Vatican prelate, who desired to remain anonymous, to these restrictions which he did not deny. This high ecclesiastic stated the attitude of his church towards the situation as it now prevails in Spain in these terms: (1) The Holy See would not oppose some relaxation of the existing restrictions on Protestants in Spain. (2) The Holy See would not suggest any relaxation. (3) In any case the Holy See would "vigorously oppose" giving Protestants the right to carry on missionary work.

Commenting on these statements, *The Christian Century* says editorially:

> That is the kind of "tolerance" that is to be looked for if the Vatican has its way. That is the program of liberty in which we are invited to collaborate as, through our ambassador at the Vatican, we seek to carry on our "parallel efforts" for peace and freedom.

I have no reason to question the factuality of these reports nor the integrity or veracity of those who record and interpret them. Further comments are hardly necessary for those of us who are always ready if not eager to cooperate with good men and women everywhere on behalf of liberty and especially on behalf of the freedom to worship and to broadcast the faith that we profess. We Protestants cannot grant to anyone, be he Catholic or Mohammedan or anything else, the right to enjoy religious liberty in a land like ours while sitting idly and indifferently by when the same liberties are being denied religious minorities in other lands. And certainly we should not sit idly by while our Catholic fellow-citizens, enjoying every privilege of freedom as regards the practice and propagation of their faith in a Protestant America, show no interest when in Catholic countries Protestant and other religious minorities are being denied similar liberties.

Our answer to the voices of religious intolerance in Italy and Spain must be firm and unequivocal; it must take a form something like this:

We share with our Catholic fellow men everywhere the respect for the Golden Rule as expressed in the words of the Master (Matthew 7,12, New Catholic Revised Version), "therefore all things whatever you would that men should do to you, even so do you also to them; for this is the Law and the Prophets." We shall fight shoulder to shoulder with our Catholic friends in defending and implementing this great command of Jesus, and we shall fight against them and anyone else who would selfishly restrict the meaning of these words and apply them unilaterally.

Omnipotence

Our eyes can plumb the pits of rimless space,
Our hands can train the atom to our will.
Yet man, with frenzy on his hate-flushed face,
Remains our test and our enigma still.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

The Division of Europe

DEVERE ALLEN

The division of Europe, intensifying daily, must be understood as due primarily to two things. The first was a triumph in the Kremlin by the nationalist, isolationist section of the Politburo. This was hastened because the Marshall Plan was winning thousands of adherents among the Communist Tovarishi throughout Europe, and especially in the satellite states. To counteract this danger, Molotov not only slammed the door at Paris, but set fire to the latchstring. The second was the Truman Doctrine, widely feared in Europe, even by the anti-Communists. The Marshall Plan was not specifically extricated from it by Washington, and the mixture of the two provided a Soviet argument —based on some reason and much sincerity—of which the fullest advantage had to be taken.

The Russian position might, in any case, have been firmly held. But between Washington's lack of clarity and Moscow's necessity, Russian recalcitrance was inevitable. Europe will henceforth, short of a miracle, fall increasingly into two rival camps. There may be trade pacts across the dividing line. That line itself may be pushed back and forth from time to time. Russia may relax its hostility to the role of Britain in the Middle East, as Stalin told Bevin at the Moscow Conference, but only if this tends to put a brake on complete American penetration. Certain dominated nations may be permitted, on occasion, to serve as ideological pipelines between east and west. But the seriousness of the split may be seen from the fact that some top observers on this side of the Atlantic have foredoomed to farcical negativism the November conference to draft a German peace treaty, while others regretfully predict that within a year Russia will have almost completely withdrawn her support from the United Nations.

Public opinion in the Americas must not be confused over the chain of events which led to the break. There are many facts which point to one conclusion: that the Russians never had the least intention of joining in the Marshall Plan, despite their attendance at the initial Paris discussions. At first, the Kremlin made no bones of its adamantine opposition. At that stage, the French and Polish sounding boards were unmistakably clear. In Warsaw, the Communist paper *Glosludu* and the Foreign Office organ *Rezczpospolita* both branded the Plan as stark imperialism. Maurice Thorez in *l'Humanité* called it a "western trap." At Moscow, *Pravda* denounced it with sardonically violent attacks.

A little later, the Politburo found that a preemptory turndown might not only hurt Russian prestige, but would give no chance to throw blame for the separation of Europe on Bevin and Bidault. Moscow had discovered how badly it had underestimated the appeal of the Plan to Communists, their followers, and millions of others inside the neighboring countries. The "line" was hurriedly adjusted. Molotov agreed to go to Paris. Thorez then modified his comments; the Molotov trip, he said then, "strikes a blow at the fishers in troubled waters." The Polish Cabinet hastily met to revise its attitude to one of watchful consideration. Tito revealed that Yugoslavia might be convinced. But Molotov had as chief adviser in Paris the fiery *Pravda* editor, Youri Joukoy. Russian reasons for the break, as all the world knows, were singularly inept, forced, and lacking in the logic often found in Soviet positions. The movie props were all set for the Russians to go home "disillusioned," to start a wholesale campaign of propaganda, to attempt a much-needed new consolidation of the eastern Soviet sphere.

In this perspective the Truman Doctrine, not recognized in Europe for the hasty and impermanent thing it had really been from the start, gave the Russians something to work with. Secretary Marshall's move could be seen in the United States as unquestionably generous and sincere. But Europeans, including those most hopeful over its good results, could hardly separate it in their thinking from the earlier Truman severity. Were the two things one and the same, or were they really different? The answer was crucial to such countries as Norway and Sweden, slow to incur Russian wrath, the latter resentfully remembering American protests over its trade agreement with Moscow. The conservative press of Europe, no less than the liberal press, was profoundly perplexed. In London *The Economist* admitted its uncertainty, subheading its article, "Trumanism in Disguise?" If this was the state of mind among the Plan's friends, what effect did this confusion have on the suspicious, if needy, governments of Eastern Europe?

But what now? Russia is justified in her belief that western reconstruction will prove a difficult task. In her German Zone, the rations are not high, but they are met. On the other hand, a reliable reporter just back from the British Zone, saw in some cases women pulling grass for "soup." There is division in the West, jealousy, mutual fears, and behind everything a lack of productive land. The West needs farm products that can be raised only, in abundance, in the Russian-dominated areas. France is torn by internal crises. Can coal be mined fast enough, can industry be revived fast enough, can unified French-British-American arrangements be created fast enough, to halt the fatal decay eating out the hearts of countless Western Europeans?

The Russian task, on the whole, appears even harder. Soviet stubbornness, and the manner of Russian isolation, immediately brought a surprising Western unity. The State Department's William Clayton, for example, came to London and bawled out the British for their shortcomings; but when he saw facts and figures on British sacrifices for the rehabilitation of German and other Continental productivity, he changed his tune, and went away determined to back Bevin and Bidault.

Other changes have been noteworthy, even well-nigh incredible. The stalwart Tory paper, *The Observer,* came out with an editorial urging a strong economic boycott of Fascist Spain. Richard Crossman, one of the Labor Party's leading pro-Soviet minority, appeared in the *Sunday Pictorial* with an article warmly supporting his erstwhile target, Ernest Bevin. The influential leftist weekly of which Mr. Crossman is an editor, *The New Statesman,* long a mouthpiece for the critics of the Labor Party's foreign policy as too anti-Russian, was oddly vague and inarticulate. Almost everywhere, in Britain and on the Continent, those who take the line followed, let us say, by Henry A. Wallace in the United States, have been stunned and

shaken.

Russia is weak to start with. True, her harvest promises to be good this year; there have been spotty improvements in industry. But she had to decree a seven-day week in her German Zone. Production at home lags woefully behind minimum needs. Worse, she has lost face with some of her most powerful friends. And she was compelled to see some of her leading spokesmen, such as Togliatti in Rome and Gottwald in Prague (until sharply called to order), cautiously embrace the Marshall offer. Halfway backing is not the drink, confusion in the ranks not the meat, on which Soviet policy fattens. Fundamentally there is this hard factor: the U.S.S.R. cannot for years produce the machinery to trade against the agricultural output of the satellite nations. The Soviet sphere must be kept in line by threats, and condemned indefinitely to inferior living standards.

In the west, dollars are vital but not alone enough. Tolerance will be needed to work with left-of-center regimes which are the most constructive in the region. Also required will be a check on hatred, to keep the present split from drenching Europe once again with the blood of hapless millions.

The Future of the Ethical Movement

A. EUSTACE HAYDON

The ethical emphasis which has been central in the Ethical Culture Movement during its history is now becoming dominant in all areas of our culture and in the cultures of all the world. When Felix Adler broke with traditional theology and ceremonialism and made moral values the supreme interest of his program he was a radical pioneer. Today, outside the seminaries, theology has receded into the background everywhere. Even the orthodox Fundamentalist who clings tenaciously to the old dogmas is likely to act in the so-called secular world exactly like his fellows who are trying to find the way to more satisfying human relationships. The theme of the leaders in science, education, economics, politics, and international relations is human values, satisfactory programs of human living, the building of the Good Society: that is, an ethical social idealism. It would be a source of pride if we could believe that the influence of the Ethical Movement had brought about this change. In fact, the new scientific knowledge, the problems of maladjustment created by applied science, the enlargement of desires, and a fuller appreciation of the possibilities of happiness in this life have forced all men of vision to the viewpoint and emphasis of the Ethical Society. Long ago Herbert Croly said, "For the first time in human history, science is providing a religion of human brotherhood with the materials out of which it may be possible to fashion the art and discipline of humane living." And Harry F. Ward, "The fighting issues of Christianity are now in the sphere of moral action, not in the realm of intellectual interpretation." And a Chinese philosopher, Y. Y. Tsu, "The test of any religion for the right to survive is in its ability to contribute to the social-economic welfare of the age. This comes before the test of intellectual worth or philosophic validity." No religion dare face the modern world with any hope of acceptance or respect and fail to come to terms with the moral issues of today. All Christian denominations have their social creeds. In two world wars the leaders of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant groups have shown that they can work harmoniously together on the practical problems of the social scene. The only advantage the Ethical Societies have over the others is that they are not compelled to tie their programs up to theological pre-suppositions and the vested interests of an inherited institutionalism. Only in this sense may the Ethical Movement claim to be prepared for leadership in the new moral orientation of culture. Some years ago in another land I suggested that the important task of the churches was to make themselves unnecessary. Emma Goldman, who was in the audience, smilingly asked, "When and where have you ever seen an institution with vested interests deliberately make itself unnecessary?" Without vested interests, except in making the values of the ethical ideal integral in our total culture, the Ethical Movement might be willing to fill that role. For if the ideal of the Good Society were being progressively realized, its work would be done.

Meanwhile, democracy has been moving haltingly and with much blundering toward that ideal. It has no superstructure of theology; it embodies the values of the moral quest; it is the living religion of this age seeking to find factual embodiment in social structure. When all phases of our culture are instruments in the service of the common weal and are unified around the purpose of achieving the society in which the good life is available for all men, Ethical religion will be actualized on the earth.

Until that time comes, there are tasks for the Ethical Societies of today and tomorrow to do. First, they may provide the prophetic voice—to counsel, to warn, to enlighten, to inspire, to analyze issues, to bring illumination to the problems of man's relation to man. But this prophetic voice must be effective, not merely a voice in the wilderness. The ancient prophets came thundering into the marketplace saying "Thus saith the Lord." Even with this backing they were not always effective. The modern prophetic voice can claim no such authority. All the speaker can say today is "These are the facts." The Elder Senator LaFollette used to say, "You can always trust the American people if you give them the facts." To get the facts, I am inclined to agree with R. H. Tawney that instead of spending millions on Gothic buildings we should put the money into research institutes and offices of fact coordination. So that the men who must speak on social issues and serve in the role of the prophets may speak with the authority of all available facts. In that way, we may have a chance to be heard and to be effective.

In the second place, the Ethical Society may be able to provide a philosophy of life that will give meaning to the diverse activities of our civilization and orient them in the direction of the ideal. It is difficult for specialists in the many narrowly defined areas of investigation and action to see how what they are doing is related to the work of others. It is useless to bring

a philosophy or theology of another age to bear upon the modern scene. Often such a theology means merely confusion of aim or loss of direction or even an undermining of the moral and human cause. A philosophy that grows out of our total knowledge, that finds its ideals in the living situation, that formulates its program on the base of scientific method, and that challenges every worker in every field to loyalty to the common cause, may give unity and thrilling meaning to the daily task of all of us.

In the third place, it seems reasonable to expect that an Ethical Movement should make a contribution to the working out of a moral code for our age. No one knows how to translate the ethical ideals we claim to revere into patterns of behavior applicable to our complex society. The ancient codes were the result of ages of experience in living, but in a very simple face-to-face social structure. Perhaps the Commandments are valid still if we knew what they mean today. Perhaps the virtues—justice, love, brotherhood, peace—are abstractions that when translated into modern behavior will claim our devotion and bring to us satisfying human relations. It should be possible for scientists in physiology, biology, medicine, psychiatry, social psychology, and the other social sciences to decide what behavior would make for the greatest happiness of the individual in social relations. This approach would be a modern and simplified way of arriving at the result achieved in earlier ages by endless trial and error. Why should we not expect to use science and its methods to arrive at a working moral code?

Meanwhile we continue the old method to conflict. The clash of conflicting desires in modern society with all its waste and woes is pointed toward the establishing of an accepted way of living. Which pattern of behavior will win out and receive social approval may be determined by force or chance and may be far removed from the way of largest individual opportunity and the greatest spread of happiness. It may even lead us to the end of the way in a cosmic exclamation point of total destruction. Until we do have a code based on our best wisdom the Ethical Societies will have to take sides in the social struggle wherever moral values and human lives are at stake. We can never be neutral when the result of neutrality may mean desertion of the human cause and the ethical ideal.

If we can work toward a scientifically achieved code, if we can provide a philosophy of life and if we are on the side of human freedom and opportunity in the modern scene, the Ethical Societies may be the rallying point for all those in hundreds of separate organizations who are trying to bring in the Good Society. We would then grow naturally as the focus of an ever larger group of like-minded men and women who are primarily concerned with the achievement of the Good Life and who would find in the fellowship of the Society the comradeship and inspiration that would make their work more effective and rewarding.

I can dream of the time when the Ethical ideal will be the dominating force in all areas of culture over all the world. Then the material satisfactions of life will be guaranteed to every individual as the basis for a full cultural life. Then every one will know the joy of creative work. Then each individual will have a sense of worth as a contributing unit of the shared life. Then all will know the joys of comradeship. Then the horizons of the world will open up to flood all of us with the cultural achievements of all men everywhere. Then the task of the Ethical religion will be on the way to ever-perfecting fulfillment. Then, and not till then, we may relax from our labors.

The Long Road to Peace

MAY STRANATHAN

Many examples of how slowly progressive movements go forward, and sometimes even progress backward, are shown in a comprehensive book, *Between War and Peace,* compiled by Florence Brewer Boeckel, and published in 1928, when she was education director of the National Council for the Prevention of War. Her quotations sound much like those we read today in the current news. From *Collier's* of September 8, 1923, she quotes: "War is purely and entirely a governmental product. The fact to get into your head is that every government, day by day, is either manufacturing war or manufacturing peace." On the same page she quotes Woodrow Wilson thus:

> Our civilization, I call you to witness, is not satisfactory. It is an industrial civilization, and at the heart of it is an antagonism between those who labor with their hands and those who direct labor. We cannot compose these differences in the midst of war, and we cannot advance civilization unless we have a peace of which we can make the fullest use in bringing these two elements together into a common partnership.

We read much today of the need in our schools of education for peaceful governments. Mrs. Boeckel notes that the Federation of Education Organizations was effected just after the National Education Association met in San Francisco in 1923, and education for peace was begun in the schools of England, France, Mexico, and other countries. David Starr Jordan of Leland Stanford University compiled a plan of work adopted by the International Federation. He won the $25,000 prize offered for such a plan. In Czechoslovakia ten peace commandments were taught in the schools, the last two being, "Do not call anyone a patriot who hates other nations, despises them, or desires war, which is a relic of barbarism," and "Love your country and nation, but work to the end that all men may live together in peace and happiness, as brethren, and that no nation need be afraid of attack by another."

In the chapter on "The Church and Peace" the statement is made that many persons state their belief that the Church has declared a moratorium on Christianity, while fighting to preserve it in name, and that if the churches allowed another World War to start they had better close their doors. Mrs. Boeckel quotes from the *Christian Century* that "the very fact of war shouts the failure of Christianity," and reminds us that during the early centuries of the Christian era officers as well as privates in the Roman army resigned and refused to fight when they became Christians. Tertullian of the early Latin Church answers a question thus: "You inquire whether a believer may enter military service. How will a Christian make war without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? In disarming Peter he disarmed every Christian." Lac-

tantius, known as the Christian Cicero, wrote: "To engage in war cannot be lawful for the righteous man, whose warfare is that of righteousness itself. Those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword."

What a contradiction to Christianity it seems that our own government has held in prison camps thousands of conscientious objectors to war and even now is still holding great numbers of them! The author of *Between War and Peace* points out that the change in the attitude in regard to war came about when the Roman empire claimed to be a Christian one and ceased to persecute Christians, and that the leaders of the Church, tired of being martyrs, began to go back to the Old Testament to justify war.

Humanists of the sixteenth century proclaimed the inconsistency of Christianity and war, and Erasmus persistently worked for peace. He is quoted as saying, "Every page of the New Testament speaks of peace and concord, yet the lives of the greater part of Christianity are engaged in nothing so much as the concerns of war." He throws down this challenge to the priests: "Dare you describe Christ as the Reconciler, the Prince of Peace, and with the same tongue commend or palliate war? It is nothing less than sounding the trumpet for Christ and for Satan at the same time." Passing over the centuries to our own land, Mrs. Boeckel tells of the attitude of the churches during the Civil War, quoting Parker Pillsbury as declaring, "We had almost to abolish the Church before we could reach the dreadful thing, slavery, at all"; and William Lloyd Garrison thus: "American Christianity is the main pillar of American slavery." She adds that "social conservatism is the besetting sin of Protestantism."

Charles and Mary Beard in *The Rise of American Civilization* write that "in 1915 the Marines carried the flag into Haiti and established American suzerainty after killing more than two thousand natives who, for one reason or another, got in the way of the operation." A reporter from the *Pittsburgh Dispatch,* who was in Haiti at that time, told me that the Marines, bored by their inactivity and the hot climate, made it their chief diversion to get drunk and go out and pick a fuss with the natives and shoot them. Liquor was cheap there. The reporter, David Davies, was sent to Haiti to organize baseball and other sports to raise the morale of the Marines in occupation there.

With a whole continent to the west on which to settle and establish a Christian civilization, in 1858 our government forcibly moved the Christianized Indian farmers from South Carolina beyond the Mississippi, among hostile tribes, because white men wished to settle on their lands. Those who have read the plea of Congressman William Sprague of Rhode Island in behalf of these Indians can never forget the pathos of their situation, as described by their champion, who asks: "Where are the Cherokees to go? What is the benefit of the change?"

The Moravian church has made public its opinion that since warfare absorbs so much of our wealth, the government should support a world court and disarmament conferences. It was the Moravian missionaries who taught Ohio Indians the Christ way of life, teaching which brought martyrdom to them because they refused to fight against the British, and were slaughtered—men, women and children—by a volunteer militia from Pennsylvania. There is now—though too late to save their lives or posterity—a monument in honor of these Indians at Gnadenhutten, Ohio, but no memorial has been raised to honor their murderers, who accused them of treason.

Voices of Latin America*
Alejandro O. Deustua: Peruvian Philosopher

JOHN H. HERSHEY

The meaning of art and beauty has been the study for many years of the philosopher, Alejandro O. Deustua of Peru. He was born as long ago as March 22, 1849, in the town of Huancayo, located west of the Peruvian capital of Lima, and lived for nearly a century, having died in August 1945. He served not only his native land but other parts of the world in various capacities. During his long life he was educator, public official, diplomat, teacher, writer, and philosopher. The Peruvian even fought in a war about territory between his country and Chile in 1879-83.

As an educator, Deustua was associated for decades with the famous University of San Marcos, situated in Lima. Having been founded in 1551, the University is the oldest in the Western Hemisphere. It is now coeducational and in a recent year had more than two thousand students in attendance. Six different colleges or faculties comprise the institution: Theology, Law, Medicine, Letters, Science, and Economics. It was in the past century that Deustua began teaching in the University. In 1902 he became professor of philosophy in the Faculty of Letters and thirteen years later its dean. Finally in 1928 he was appointed president or rector of the ancient university. Not long afterward, however, he retired to private life. One Peruvian writer who commented on Deustua not long ago said that in his old age he continued to possess remarkable intellectual vitality and a devoted love for student youth.

Besides being active in the University of San Marcos, Deustua also served his native land by holding various political offices in the National Government. Furthermore, his activities extended beyond Peru to other nations. As a diplomat he lived in Argentina, Brazil, and Spain. At one time he was sent by the Peruvian Government to Europe to study primary and secondary education. Deustua was also in the United States in 1915 representing the University of San Marcos at the second Pan-American Scientific Congress held in Washington, D. C., and was elected its vice-president. This brief survey may thus give an idea of some of Deustua's activities in his own land and in other countries during his long and fruitful life.

Let us now turn to Deustua as a philosopher. Just as in the past the Positivist doctrines of the French philosopher Auguste Comte, influenced such Latin Americans as Enrique José Varona of Cuba, Gabino Barreda of Mexico, and others, so in a more recent

*The tenth of a series of articles on Latin-American leaders appearing from time to time in the columns of UNITY.

period another French thinker, Henri Bergson, influenced men like José Vasconcelos of Mexico, Alejandro Korn of Argentina, and Deustua also. It was when the Peruvian philosopher was in Europe that he became influenced by the ideas of Bergson who opposed the philosophy of the mechanical evolution of life, affirming instead its "creative" evolution. Returning to his native land from Europe, Deustua applied the French thinker's ideas in his original way to aesthetics especially. Mechanistic naturalism, Deustua believed, is extended illegitimately to living and thinking beings, and is even an insufficient interpretation of the purely physical world of events. The following paragraphs attempt to outline important points of Deustua's philosophy of aesthetics, and are based mostly on several long essays published some years ago in issues of the Argentine periodical, *Revista de Filosofía.* The Peruvian also wrote about the theory of morality, but his predominant interest through many years was in the field of aesthetics.

In seeking to understand Deustua's philosophy of art and beauty, it is necessary to recognize the importance he placed on liberty. When the religious mystic, for example, aspires to lose his consciousness by being completelly absorbed in the divine nature, then liberty of the human soul disappears. Freedom, however, exists in the economic, legal, and moral realms, but is subordinated to certain laws and standards, and hence is relative. There is a field, nevertheless, in which absolute liberty exists. It is in artistic activity. Standards and norms in art are the outcome of the free will and imagination of the artist. "Only in the aesthetic order is liberty absolute; only in it norms are not imperative. The activity of the artistic genius rejects all imposition because it is characterized by absolute liberty."

This freedom in artistic endeavor and achievement is creative. The will and imagination of the artist are expressions of complete liberty. "The work of art, like the beautiful work of nature, has its only explanation in the principle of liberty." "Liberty and creation are identical." There are two kinds of liberty in the arts. Static liberty is revealed in the order and harmony of beautiful objects. But liberty, properly speaking, in artistic production is dynamic and creative. The creative is primary; the static, secondary, derived from the first. With reference to particular arts, freedom is revealed in architecture even though it is the artistic expression of the inorganic and inert, while music, on the other hand, is the paramount example of free art.

Deustua considered also the relation between nature and art. "Man is able to enjoy the beautiful which the spectacles of Nature offer him, as if they were the works of a supreme artist who, in his infinite freedom, modifies them incessantly and exhibits them in their immense variety." But nature, even in all its beauty and grandeur, cannot fully satisfy the aesthetic sense; hence the need for the arts produced by the spirit of man. But a relation between nature and art does exist. Art can be thought of as a second creation of nature. An artistic object, however, is not a direct but rather an indirect creation through man in whom the dynamic life of nature is converted into creative spirit. The non-living world is indeed opposed to the spirit of man; but the living realm is not, even when it offers resistance because of its limitations. Thus the life of nature becomes expressed in the artist as creative mind, and "the work of art is a continuation of the work of nature."

Finally, the venerable Peruvian philosopher, Alejandro O. Deustua, related freedom and love and art to one another in the following words: "As liberty cannot be developed except within from a solidarity which is love, liberty and love ought to edify art."

Supernatural Religions Are Similar

PHILIP SCHUG

It is often assumed that the Christian religion is a unique religion and far superior to the other religions of the world. In fact, earnest devotees consider it the only real religion in the world—all others being mere superstitions. Reasons usually given for such a lofty estimate include superior moral qualities, divine inspiration of its scriptures, a personal and divine "savior," and a personal experience of the deity or "savior" which is proof of the claims of the religion.

Few of the very earnest devotees are interested in learning anything about the other religions of the world except insofar as that knowledge bolsters their preconceptions of the superiority of their religion. However, let us look at some of the similarities of other living religions.

There are eleven great living religions: Hinduism, Judaism, Shinto, Zoroastrianism, Taoism, Jainism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Christianity, Muhammadanism, and Sikhism in order from the oldest to the youngest. Hinduism and Judaism are about twice as old as Christianity, and the youngest, Sikhism, was founded about the time Columbus discovered America.

Every one of these religions has a Bible or sacred scriptures, and in each case the sacred literature is claimed to be pre-eminent above the rest of the literature in the culture. The Rig Veda (Hinduism) and the Koran (Muhammadanism) are claimed to be verbally inspired—that is, written by the deity of the religion through the medium of inspired writers—and for both of them a literal infallibility is claimed that is identical to the claim made for the Christian scriptures by the most fundamental followers.

Every one of them claims a divine revelation either past or present. Nobody is left without a sufficient "proof" of the "truth" of the claims of his religion.

Five of the eleven religions have founders who were supernaturally conceived (the virgin birth idea). According to Buddhist sacred literature Gautama Buddha was announced to his prospective mother, a queen, in much the same manner that Jesus was announced to his mother. Buddha's mother was forty-five years old at his birth, and he was her first child. Mahavira, the founder of Jainism, was announced in a series of fourteen wonderful dreams as he was placed in his mother's womb by supernatural means. His mother was of royal lineage. Zoroaster was born to a young woman of fifteen who was supernaturally "glorified." Zoroastrian scriptures predict three other

saviors to be born of fifteen-year-old virgins who will be impregnated by supernatural means. The greatest miracle of them all is claimed by the followers of Lao-tse (Taoism, which is pronounced "Dow-ism," incidentally). Lao-tse was born a fully matured "Wise Old Boy" or "Wise Old Philosopher." Through supernatural action he was carried in his mother's womb for seventy-two or eighty-one years, depending upon which account you follow. He was really "unspotted by the world." The Christian story of the virgin birth, which follows the older stories very closely, is well-known to most of us.

The idea of a supreme being or deity is found in all of the religions, though in their original forms Buddhism and Jainism repudiated the idea. The idea of one supreme being, monotheism, is found in Muhammadanism, Sikhism, Judaism, and Christianity, though Christianity has veered far toward polytheism with its Holy Family and three-fold Godhead.

Miracles are, of course, very common in all of the major living religions of the world. Buddha, who was a non-theist, was claimed by his followers to be a great miracle worker. Like Jesus, but hundreds of years before him, he is said to have walked on water, healed the sick, performed many miracles in order to convert people, fed 500 people without previous supplies, etc. It is almost impossible to think of him claiming any of these things for himself, however. Muhammad did his best to escape from those who wanted him to work miracles, but his followers have endowed him with great powers in this respect. Zoroaster escaped miracle working in his earliest documents, but in the later ones became a prodigious operator.

The moral superiority of Christianity is often claimed to be proved by the positive statement of the golden rule. Confucius said, "What you do not want done to yourself, do not do unto others," while Jesus admonishes, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." It is difficult to see much difference in the statements in their ultimate working out in social life, but if the latter is considered to be superior to the former it must be admitted that the golden rule as found in the scriptures of the Taoists is even better than that found in Christian literature: "Recompense injury with kindness," and "To those who are good to me, I am good; and to those who are not good to me, I am also good. And thus all get to be good. To those who are sincere with me, I am sincere; and to those who are not sincere with me, I am also sincere. And thus all get to be sincere." Not only is it very concrete, but the reasons for doing good in all cases are given. It is not just a command to be followed blindly, but with understanding and insight into the social consequences of doing good in all situations. Of course, the golden rule in one form or another is in nearly all of the great religious systems as well as in some of the philosophical systems that are not considered religions. Aristotle, for example, said, "Treat your friends as you would want them to treat you."

As you would expect, every great living religion assures its followers that they will inherit immortal life, and many of them make it clear that only the faithful (of the particular religion) will be favored in the next life. The people who do not follow the particular religion faithfully will be cast into the many versions of hell. It does not take a very brilliant person to see that some terrific "cosmic" problems arise from these many contradictory claims.

Basically the eleven great living religions are very similar. In fact there is much borrowing of ideas between the living religions. Zoroastrian ideas of good and evil and of heaven and hell are found clearly in Judaism, Christianity, and Muhammadanism. The oriental religions borrow quite freely from one another. Surprisingly enough to one brought up in a Christian atmosphere, many of the great religions are also tolerant of each other. A Confucian may also be something of a Buddhist or Taoist without losing the respect of his fellows or being condemned by his scriptures. Tolerance of differing views is found in five of the great religions, but it is not found in Christianity, which is intolerant of all the others.

The Circle

"From leaden dogma and wing-clipping rules,
I crave deliverance!" the prophet cried.
And his apostles, in acclaiming schools,
Flocked to the freedom he personified.

Ardent to follow him, they made a code
Of his pronouncements; made his words their tools . . .
Until once more they bowed beneath a load
Of leaden dogma and wing-clipping rules.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

The Study Table

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

Here and There Among Recent "Judaica"

PROMISED LAND. *By Ellen Thorbecke. New York: Harper & Bros. $3.50.*

A PALESTINE PICTURE BOOK. *By Jakob Rosner. Schocken Books. $5.00.*

ON BEING A JEW. *By Leon I. Feuer. New York: Bloch Publishing Company. $2.50.*

RABBI MEIR OF ROTHENBURG. *By Irving A. Agus. New York: Bloch Publishing Company. 2 Vols. $7.50.*

There has been a recent and refreshing upturn in non-Jewish preoccupation with Jewish books, particularly such as deal with Palestine, and to a lesser degree with those of general Jewish interest. There are even some Christian readers and students who today, more than probably ever before, are devoting time and energy to specific problems of Jewish history and culture.

The first type of reader will welcome the two books on Palestine mentioned above. They commend themselves especially to those non-Jews for whom the question of the rehabilitation of Palestine as a Jewish national home has assumed more than academic interest. Ellen Thorbecke, wife of the one-time Netherlands minister to China, has done a most commendable job in

Promised Land. The book is well written, beautifully illustrated, tastefully and practically bound, and all in all represents an excellent example of American authorship as well as book-craft, the latter circumstance calling for a special word of commendation for the publishers, Harper and Brothers. Mrs. Thorbecke begins with a brief historical introduction that takes the reader back almost four thousand years, and then plunges into the fascinating story of the "New Palestine." Every page of text is accompanied by illustrations, charts, or maps that make the volume a mine of information and a delight to the eye. She tells the story of Zionism's achievements particularly since the Balfour Declaration, and her objective narrative and authentic reporting of things done by the Jewish settlers in Eretz Yisroel are in themselves an argument for a "Jewish Palestine" as hard to meet as to ignore. Here are pages of pictures and figures and "exhibits" that clinch the case for the Zionist cause which is also being so pathetically pleaded these days by hundreds of thousands of Jewish displaced and homeless persons.

An admirable supplement to the Thorbecke volume is *A Palestine Picture Book,* which presents one hundred and twenty-one photographs by Jakob Rosner, a Palestinian photographer, whose camera so effectively has caught the land and its people "from Dan to Beersheba, from the peak of Mount Carmel to the Dead Sea." Primarily concerned with Jewish Palestine, with the revival of the land under the magic touch of Jewish faith and devotion, and with the regeneration of Jewish national life, these pictures are a mute and yet eloquent testimony to that heroic spirit of sacrifice and love of homeland that has turned Eretz Yisroel from an arid desert-land into an area that soon again, if not hampered by selfish imperialism and stupid colonial policy, will blossom into a garden "flowing with milk and honey." The Thorbecke and Rosner books should be "must" items in any church-school library where the study of Palestine and Zionism has become a major project; they commend themselves especially to young people's groups as well as to the serious attention of men's and women's organizations.

To the Christian reader interested in the general problem of Jewish adjustment to a non-Jewish environment and especially in the American Jewish scene, I heartily recommend Rabbi Leon I. Feuer's brilliant little book, *On Being a Jew.* The author several years ago gave us that stimulating study in Zionism, entitled *Why a Jewish State,* and he here addresses his American fellow-Jews concerning the many problems they face as a cultural and religious minority. "These problems need to be stated in simple and understandable words, in non-theological and non-sociological terminology," says the author, and he proceeds to do that in eleven brief and closely argued chapters that demonstrate conclusively that Rabbi Feuer understands not only his people, their history, their tradition, and their present situation, but also the larger world of which Jewry is a part.

Rabbi Feuer addresses his people frankly and boldly. He is talking to a people that has every reason to stand up to the world and to ask of it just treatment and the respect which is due a nation that has survived persecution and discrimination and decimation for centuries, and that now demands before the court of world opinion equality of status among the peoples of the world, the privileges of democracy and self-determination, and the return of its ancient homeland.

In the chapter, "Recovering Self-Respect," the author says:

> To be a Jew, it is not necessary to isolate yourself either from the company or friendship of non-Jews. Quite the contrary, Jews should move freely in the company of Gentiles and make friendships among them. Such contacts are mutually enriching. But let it be stressed again, friendship is only sound and lasting when it is on a basis of mutuality and equal repect.

And in the concluding chapter, "The Spirit of Resistance," we read in the closing paragraph these challenging words, "It is a new Jew which is needed for our time—a straight-backed Jew, a staunch and self-respecting Jew, a Jew worthy of the free world of tomorrow, a Jew who will strike a blow for his own freedom in that world." Such words should not only stiffen the backbone of the Jew but also increase the non-Jew's admiration for a people that will stand up and, if necessary, fight for its inalienable rights.

To the non-Jewish reader interested in specific topics of Jewish history and culture, the two volumes by Dr. Irving A. Agus dealing with the life and works of Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg should prove a fascinating study of one of the most significant epochs in Jewish history. The second half of the thirteenth century, the period following the crusades, was "one of the most critical in the history of European Jewry." The brutal policy both of the Church and the State of the Middle Ages towards the Jewish community came to a head in these years, and, as the author states in his Preface, "the personal subjugation and political enslavement of the Jew began in this period, thus inaugurating the dark age of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries."

At this time, there arose a leader in Israel, Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg (1215?-1293), whose "Responsa," i. e., "written answers, to queries of a legal or religious nature," are here presented in translation and interpretation by an American Jewish scholar. "The Responsa literature," so the author tells us,

> came into being because of the desire of the Jews to live in accordance with the Talmud, because of the lack of an ordained group of men whose opinion would be final on account of their position and because of the great need of the Jews for a supreme arbiter in ritual, legal, and community matters. It was the product of an active and creative life permeated by deep religious feeling; and it was the result of a yearning for complete religious freedom, for self-government and group autonomy in the midst of a foreign and often hostile environment.

The reader will find in the "Responsa" of Rabbi Meir much that throws interesting light upon Jewish history and experience of that time and of later centuries, and as he reads intelligently and with an unbiased mind he will grow to understand much in contemporary Jewish life, culture, and mores that hitherto has remained strange, alien, and often suspect to him. And Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg may perform an even more significant function in enlightening the Gentile; he may help demolish that stupid and entirely unwarranted prejudice especially in Christian minds to the effect that Jewish history came to an end with the establishment of the Old Testament canon, or at the latest with the destruction of Jewish nationalism in 135 C. E. The figure of Rabbi Meir is just one of the many Jewish teachers and leaders who for more than two thousand years have labored to interpret Torah and Prophets to their own people and to interpret Judaism to the world at large. In other words, Dr. Agus' scholarly and comprehensive work has a real "mission." May it help "convert" many a *goi!*

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

GENEVA SUCCESS

The Lake Geneva Conference, officially known as the Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly, celebrated its tenth Anniversary by breaking all records for attendance. The total registration reached 487 before the close of the Conference. There were registrants from Massachusetts to California and the Panama Canal Zone. The spirit and the enthusiasm engendered indicate another record breaking conference next year.

GENEVA BOARD

The Geneva Conference adopted a new set of by-laws. Under these the following people were elected to the Board.

One Year:
Rev. Harold P. Marley, Dayton, Ohio.
Mrs. Esther L. Heinrich, Oak Park, Ill.
Robert Larson, Rockford, Ill.

Two Years:
Mrs. Dudley Moore, Detroit, Mich.
Mr. W. A. Hambly, Milwaukee, Wis.
Mr. J. G. Princell, St. Louis, Mo.

Three Years:
Mrs. Gladys R. Hilton, Chicago, Ill.
Mrs. Kenneth Casson, Rockford, Ill.
Mr. Fritz Schaefer, Indianapolis, Ind.

Ex Officio:
Randall S. Hilton, Western Unitarian Conference.
Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, A.U.Y. Director.
Rev. Kenneth L. Patton, Ministerial Union.

The officers elected by the Board are:
Chairman—W. A. Hambly.
Vice-Chairman—Gladys Hilton.
Secretary—Esther Heinrich.
Treasurer—Fritz Schaefer.
Registrar—Esther Heinrich.

UNITED APPEAL

Mr. John B. Fisher, the new Director of the United Unitarian Appeal, spoke to the delegates to the Geneva Conference. During the course of his exceptional talk he announced that the Appeal goal for next year would be $500,000. Half of this is for the Unitarian Service Committee.

Mr. Fisher is a native of California, a Harvard graduate, and was an operations officer for amphibian units under Admiral Halsey. He has had experience in public relations and finance.

The Appeal plans and program are well under way. You will be hearing from Mr. Fisher soon. We bespeak your cooperation. The cause is worth it and the need is urgent.

VISITS EUROPE

The Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Rockford, has returned from spending the summer in Europe with the Medical Mission of the Unitarian Service Committee. The Rev. Horton Colbert of the Universalist Church in Rochester, Minnesota, is also back from Europe. He visited many of the Service Committee projects in France and Switzerland. Dr. Wallace W. Robbins is still in Europe where he is attending the planning meetings for the International Fellowship of Religious Liberals. The International Conference will be held in Prague next summer.

CARL STORM

The Rev. Carl A. Storm began his ministry of the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, Minnesota, on August first. He succeeds the Rev. Raymond B. Bragg, now the Director of the Unitarian Service Committee. Mr. Storm was formerly minister at Lincoln, Nebraska.

MELVIN WELKE

The Rev. Melvin Welke, minister for the past several years of the First Unitarian Church of Cincinnati, Ohio, has resigned as of September 1. Mr. Welke has taken a business position. Before going to Cincinnati he served the church in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. He is a member of the Board of the Meadville Theological School.

BOARD MEETINGS

The Board of Directors of the Western Unitarian Conference met in Chicago on Monday, September 29th. The Executive Committee of the Unitarian Ministerial Union met in Chicago on Tuesday, September 30th.

GENERAL CONFERENCE

The General Conference of Unitarian Churches will meet in Washington, D. C., October 15-17, 1947. This is the regular biennial conference and is of outstanding importance. It is hoped that the churches of the Western Conference will be well represented.

STATE CONFERENCES

The Minnesota Unitarian Conference held its annual meetings at Camp Ihduhapi on Lake Independence, Minnesota. The Iowa Unitarian Association will meet at Des Moines the week-end of October 31 to November 2.

CHURCH BURNS

The building of the First Unitarian Church of Sioux City, Iowa, burned early in July. It was a total loss. The temperature of the day was 107. Spontaneous combustion seems the most likely cause of the fire. Several places were offered to the congregation for the purpose of holding services. One of them will be accepted and services will be held as usual. The Rev. John W. Brigham is the minister.

THE JUNE REGISTER

The June issue of the *Christian Register* was the Western Conference issue and was edited by the Secretary of the Conference. Those churches desiring extra copies for sale and distribution may order them from the Conference office. The supply is limited so please order promptly. This is the issue with the Frank Lloyd Wright cover. Copies sell for twenty cents. Discounts for orders of ten or more. The office will make every effort to see that all Western Conference Churches can have some additional copies if they want them.

THE BIENNIAL CONFERENCE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
OCTOBER 15-17, 1947